

# The Classical Bulletin

Published monthly except July, August, and September, by St. Louis University. Subscription price: \$1.00 a Year.  
Entered as second-class matter at St. Louis, Mo., Post-Office.

Vol. XIX

MAY, 1943

No. 8

## The Sock and the Spear in High School Classics

By LEO M. KAISER  
The University of Illinois

I have a confession to make before proceeding with this paper. I have not been orthodox. My only defense is, that having just risen from the feet of the magistri for the last time in formal classes, I may from this mid-point and from the psychology still of the student, who likes and dislikes perhaps without much rhyme or reason, put forth some remarks on a question which has long disturbed me; namely: why the lack of companions on the journey through the Classics?

The likes and dislikes of high-school days still are vivid before me, and it is with this in mind that I have tried to answer the problem of my solitary way. My solution is one that Lucretius once gave when even he might have loved Epicurus less, *Dictis dabit ipsa fidem res*.

And but one more prefatory remark that the ground may be safe beneath me in my unorthodoxy. As I recall my high-school Classics, style, literary quality, and so on, were things I took on faith, and with this faith, quiescent, satisfying, raising its head now and then, I looked forward to what my early authors were to unfold before me—and was disappointed.

In titling this paper as I have, "The Sock and the Spear in High School Classics," I have given a larger, more inclusive meaning to the words than would appear. 'Spear' is to hold more than Caesar and his wars. But I am anticipating. . . . As you may have suspected already, my basic contention is that assuming his possession of 'faith,' as I have called it, the high school student is first and foremost interested in what the author has to say, that is, 'content.' We find that in the study of other languages, passing over the native English where the drawing of an analogy is not warranted because of no need or presence of translation, that curricula are drawn up mostly with an eye to engaging subject matter, and that, too, where the difficulties of translation are smaller than in the case of Latin. We have the *Fabeln* and *Geschichte*, the novelle, the cuentos, comprising the early courses in modern languages.

But in the early courses in Latin we have what I shall term the 'Spear,' the marvelously lucid notebooks of Caesar, the masterful oratory of Cicero. But the *Gallic War* tells of battles long ago, of whose historical place and importance the student necessarily knows and appreciates little, in the relation of which the 'blood and thunder' occasionally interspersed maintains his interest. And the greatest possible disadvantage the student must face is the lack of historical background—knowledge of a man, one of the greatest in the pages of human history, knowledge of his times, some of the

most crucial, two factors (if we prescind from the question of literary quality which the student can but take on faith) that alone contribute to an appreciative reading of Caesar. The same holds true of Cicero and his inclusion in the curricula. Controversy (which appeared some time ago in the pages of the CLASSICAL BULLETIN) still boils over the wholesomeness of the content of the *Catilinarians* for the student. But upon this point I shan't venture comment, remembering the Soeratic dictum of old Gottfried Hermann: *Scientia est nesciendi*.

If we exclude the historian or the student with historical interests, one of the primary interests in Caesar and Cicero as the case turns out to be, is style, exactly what the student can least appreciate. There is, however, a very strong defense, one backed by years of tradition, for what I have called the Spear and its place in curricula. And that is the argument based on the need of the student to master grammar and syntax. I wish that I had both the space and time here to discuss that moot point at length. It is a favorite subject of controversy with me. But I think we shall all admit that grammar is one of the necessary evils of life. Erasmus, the great Dutch classicist, had this to say of it: *Multis amara sunt grammatices praecepta*, and proceeded to write his *Colloquia* so that the student might pass as quickly as possible to the joys of reading.

The whole emphasis in the study of Latin since the day of Basil Gildersleeve has been on grammar. I am afraid that it has almost become a fetish, that Latin has become an academic exercise, a discipline. I am afraid, too, that ultimately tradition regards Caesar and Cicero as containing so many illustrations of things grammatical. The time of disemphasization has already come, but not completely enough. Students still continue to lose interest in oratory and military campaigns when that represents Latin Literature. Ironically enough, they study French and Spanish and enjoy them, but the mother language blushes unseen.

What can be given the student that will make him early, and I underline 'early,' discover and realize that Latin is a literature in every sense of the term? To my mind certainly not a *mélange*, a mosaic, of excerpts from various authors. The strength of impressions, and the enjoyment derived therefrom, lies in unity, in the presentation of a whole. But one answer to the question, not an original one to be sure, is the 'Sock' instead of the Spear. I mean Roman Comedy. And there my unorthodoxy gets and has gotten me in trouble, first, because I would recommend it before or even in place of Caesar and Cicero, secondly, because certain objections are advanced. But when the initial shock of the idea of Roman Comedy in high school has worn off, we may take up the objections, and later the points of recommendation.

The objections are none that cannot be overcome. We would have to have consideration for the delicateness of subject matter at times in comedy. We would have to modify archaisms, to give the proper vocabulary-aid, to iron out difficulties of grammatical construction and the *sermo cottidianus*.

And in return for our labors we are able to present to the students at the outset a unified whole; classical works, not watered-down, alien pieces; a literary type more familiar to them, and one more to be met with in later readings in other literatures; and finally and most importantly, works with a high degree of content-interest, so that students may study Latin from the peaks of Darien, so to speak, realizing that Latin has all the unknown, enchanting vistas of other literatures, that it does not turn a grim visage to them, but actually can sport the sock of comedy.

It was a pleasurable surprise when by chance I ran across an edition of the *Phormio* of Terence for high school students by Fairclough and Richardson.<sup>1</sup> In the introduction, the following statement is made: "Students, entering upon the study of German, French, or Spanish, begin with the language of daily life, and are led on by gradual stages to the higher forms of literature; in Latin we reverse the process and confine our school studies to Roman historical, oratorical, and poetical works. Some of the very few, who continue their Latin studies at college, may reach a point where they will read a play of Terence or Plautus, but as for the rest, they leave school with the rooted conviction or, at least, impression that Latin is a purely artificial language."<sup>2</sup>

Now of the comic writers, Plautus is, of course, the more rollicking, yet Terence offers the student a more choice diction, an easier syntax. At any rate, whichever author is preferred, the Sock, before the Spear or even in place of it in the high-school curriculum, can make a pretense both at content-interest for the student, whose first readings in Latin are the all-important, and at style, that whereby he may still keep his faith strong.

To any plan such as this, tradition is the strongest opponent, for certainly the other objections cited are those to be met practically with every author. We have been engaged much too long with the Spear. The conception of Latin in the mind of the young student has become a warped, distorted thing of only occasional appeal.

Would horizons widen perchance, and would the students' hearts leap up, were Thalia to sport the comic sock? Unorthodoxy fondly hopes so.

<sup>1</sup> Sanborn & Co., Boston, 1909.

<sup>2</sup> By the kind permission of the publishers.

### Accelerated Courses

"I don't like to criticize my superiors, but I feel impelled to say that literary studies cannot be 'accelerated' as perhaps engineering studies can, though I must say that I have run across engineers who are skeptical of that too. However, 'mine is not to reason why' and I shall do my best in the time at my disposal and with what energy 'accelerated education' leaves. As long as it doesn't have to be 'progressive' education, perhaps I should be satisfied."—W. H. A.

### Why the Latin Teacher Needs to Know Greek

RAYMOND V. SCHODER, S.J.  
St. Louis University

That all Latin teachers *should* know Greek will be admitted by even those who have no intention of fulfilling the ideal. But that a Latin teacher *needs* to know Greek to be fully adequate to his calling may be a proposition to arouse more dissent, even, perhaps, consternation. Yet it is a conviction of all who face the issue squarely.

However, the usual explanation of *why* the Latin teacher needs Greek seems not to be built on the most clear and effective angle of approach. We are told that because the Latin authors were steeped in Greek literature, therefore the really adequate teacher of them must also be conversant with the Greek background to the authors' thought and literary technique. This is, of course, a valid and persuasive argument. But is there not a still better one? The reader (and a *fortiori* the teacher) of a Latin work must know Greek, in order properly to appreciate the piece, not merely because the author wrote it from a knowledge of Greek, but because the author expected his readers to know Greek, and to approach his work from that background.

Nearly every major Latin author simply took it for granted that his readers would be familiar with Greek language, thought, and literature, and wrote his works on that assumption. It is a matter of history that the origins, development, spirit, form, and critical tastes of Latin literature grew up under the dominating influence of Greek authors, and were established to a very large (though not total) extent on a Greek basis. From Livius Andronicus to Claudian, Latin writers drew upon Greek sources and models for a major element of their works. And since a literary education at Rome consisted to a large degree in a cultured familiarity with Greek authors, the Latin writers could treat this Greek element in their work in a way which would be impossible, and abortive, if this knowledge of Greek on the part of their intended readers could not be safely assumed.

In fact, they *had* to write on this assumption. For the despots of their immediate fate and success—the critics—would appraise their work on standards largely founded on Greek masterpieces of a similar form or intent. The more intelligent critics, of course, would also take into account the traditions and intrinsic peculiarities of the Latin tongue; but their primary ideal would be a Latin work which approached, in its own way, the perfection and effect of similar compositions by the Greek masters. The *norm* of a good Latin epic, for instance, was Homer's poems; bucolic poetry must rival Theocritus on his own ground; lyrics were not lyrical unless they bore comparison and resemblance to those of Sappho, Alcaeus, and the other Greek lyric poets, or turned their principles to new and equally effective use; if a Latin play did not essentially conform to the Greek tragic or comic tradition, it simply could not be a good play.

All this was not arbitrary, or mere stagnant conservatism. It was (and still is) a fact that the Greek masterpieces exhibit those unchanging, essential features

which must characterize any successful effort at literary expression within the same genres. Details of accidental form or secondary technique are of course open to legitimate variation. Only the poetic satire at Rome, and in modern times the highly elaborate novel, are original forms of literature not touched more than obliquely by Greek predecessors. For the rest, literary history can only say with Lucretius, in both a temporal and (usually) a hierarchic sense, *primum Graius homo*.

The educated Roman, then, for whom our Latin authors primarily wrote, was by right and by necessity, like Horace's friend Maecenas, *doctus utriusque linguae*. If we are to approach these authors today with adequate sympathy and understanding, we too must first qualify for superior readership by a firsthand acquaintance with the relevant Greek works in the light of which the Latin author expected to be read, appreciated, and understood. Not only was he himself conversant with the themes, treatment, imagery, and actual phrases and passages, of the Greek masters whom he emulated, but he took it for granted that his readers would be too, and that in consequence they would detect and appreciate his many conscious reactions to Greek influence.

These reactions may be seen in five distinct forms: borrowings and quotations, allusions, adaptations of Greek passages, general association with spirit or doctrine of Greek works, and incorporation of Greek linguistic features whether of word, form, or grammatical construction. For example, when Lucretius describes frustrated political ambition as equivalent to the torment of Sisyphus, and borrows for the purpose not only the statement but the famous onomatopoeic rhythm of Homer's passage, he is hoping his reader will recall the original, and see how cleverly he has reproduced the effect in Latin. And it is indeed a bit of artistry to be proud of, as comparison of the lines will show:

hoc est adverso nixantem trudere monte  
saxum quod tamen e summo iam vertice rusum  
volvitur et plani raptim petit aequora campi.

(*De Rerum Natura* 3.1000-1003)

λαῶν ἄνω ὤθεσκε ποτὶ λόφον· ἄλλ' ὅτε μέλλοι  
ἄκρον ὑπερβαλεῖν, τότ' ἀποστρέψασκε κραταίῳ·  
αὐτίς ἔπειτα πέδονδε κυλίνδετο λαῶς ἀναίδης.  
(*Odyssey* 11.596-598)

Again, when Pliny (*Epist.* 8.2) quotes without mention of source the epigrammatic line: ἐν δὲ τῇ τιμῇ ἡμὲν κακὸς ἦδ' ἐκάλ' ἐσθλός, he takes it for granted that his reader will recognize it as Homer's (*Iliad* 9.319), and declines to insult him by presuming to explain what is obvious. The reference to a human victim of some catastrophe being 'cast a prey to the dogs and the birds of heaven' in Vergil's *Aeneid* 9.485 (and in Ovid, *Heroides* 10.96 and Catullus 64.152-153) is an allusion to the famous lines at the opening of the *Iliad* (1.4-5), which any reader, ancient or modern, ought to be ashamed (in these authors' view) to require having pointed out to him by a footnote. When Vergil in an *Eclogue* consciously both takes over and artfully alters an idyll of Theocritus, or Horace adopts a poem of Alcaeus as model of his own ode to the *Ship of State* (*Odes* 1.14), they justifiably expect their readers to be able to appreciate, from their own familiarity with the Greek poems, the resemblances and the artful modifications in their rehandling of the old theme. So, too,

Cicero intends his *Somnium Scipionis* and many of his other works to be read with enough anterior acquaintance with Platonic, Neo-Platonic, and Stoic thought to share with him in relishing the numerous associations between his work and those philosophical-literary writings.

On the simpler but even more evident plane of linguistic or grammatical deference to Greek, the point of our contention is still more clearly borne out. Even such early writers as Plautus and Terence expect of their ill-educated audience a surprising familiarity with the Greek language. Into the midst of a swift-moving dialogue, Plautus occasionally injects words of untranslated Greek, such as the παῦσαι of *Trinummus* 187 or the οἶχεται later in the same play (419). They are not there only for Plautus' private enjoyment! Similarly, in the *Captivi* (880-883), he has Ergasilus swear by Proserpina in Greek: καὶ τὰν Κόρην, and then, as this is also the name of a town, go on to swear by other Italian towns, putting them all, for the sake of fun, in Greek feminine endings by analogy. The whole point of the joke would be lost on the Greekless. In Terence, such phrases as *tibi scribam dicam* (*Phormio* 127) are sure to be puzzling unless one recognizes in them the Greek word carried over bodily in transliteration (in this case the Greek for 'indictment': δίκη). Grammatical forms like the 'Greek accusative,' the feminine gender of *atomus*, etc., and the need of knowing the Greek form in order to read metrically such words as *hērōās* are further instances in point.

Finally, the usually stressed advantage—the need of Greek to see the author's background—must also be respected. It is a fact that only thus can we know the sources of the author's thought, his significance and merits in the context of the whole literary picture, and his relative stature as an artist.

The teacher may, of course, protest that he can mine out all this Greek erudition from scholarly commentaries to the texts. But if only acquired in this way, it is sure to sit too lightly, and never to have that personal, intimate quality and sure grasp at firsthand without which one cannot be a superior Latin teacher—a teacher who has fully assimilated the content and riches of the author in a vital, appreciative way. Even though much of this deeper understanding will be only indirectly communicable to the students, nevertheless it should be part of the teacher's ready equipment.

Some timid souls are likely to cry out at all this as imposing on them a further, too-heavy burden. To this there is only one satisfactory answer: at least learn Greek for your very *Latin's* sake, which is worth even that trouble.

But after all, is not this objection based on a misapprehension? Greek, you see, is not a task; it is a delight!<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> [Those who don't think so, but are honest doubters open to persuasion, might test their resistance to the evidence presented in the author's pamphlet, *Pity the Greekless*. Privately printed, 1942. Obtainable from the author at five cents a copy. Ed. Note]

Q. Ennius tria corda ('three brains'; H. J. Rose) habere se dicebat, quod loqui Graece et Osce et Latine sciebat.—Gellius xvii, 17, 1.



# The Classical Bulletin

Published monthly except July, August and September by  
St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

Subscription price: \$1.00 a year

Entered as second-class matter, at the post-office at St. Louis,  
Mo., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

## EDITOR

James A. Kleist, S.J.

St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

## ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Francis A. Preuss, S.J. St. Stanislaus Sem'y, Florissant, Mo.  
A. A. Jacobsmeyer, S.J. St. Stanislaus Sem'y, Florissant, Mo.  
Joseph A. Walsh, S.J. Milford Novitiate, Milford, Ohio  
F. A. Sullivan, S.J. St. Andrew-on-Hudson, Poughkeepsie, N. Y.  
Francis X. Entz, S.J. Spring Hill College, Mobile, Ala.  
James E. Malone, S.J. Alma College, Alma, Cal.  
Carol L. Bernhardt, S.J. Weston College, Weston, Mass.

## BUSINESS EDITOR

William J. Brennan, S.J. St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.

Vol. XIX

MAY, 1943

No. 8

## Editorial

Admirers of the light Greek elegiac or epigram will be pleased with *Asklepiades of Samos*, a daintily presented booklet by William Wallace, Assistant Professor of Classics in the University of Colorado, and Mary Wallace.<sup>1</sup> Each of the forty-five pieces from the Greek Anthology is accompanied by a verse translation and a selection of versions by other hands. Extremely little is known about Asklepiades, who flourished about 300 B.C. His manner is of the well-known type popularized by Greek writers of amatory verse.

The chief value of this booklet is, we think, in the excellent material provided by the authors for a study of the methods of translation. Any translator of a Greek poet is lucky if he catches one conspicuous trait of the original. As to his choice of form, there is room for variety, as J. S. Phillimore, who is frequently mentioned among the contributors, confesses: "I have cast them into one now and now another measure in English, according as exigencies of space dictated or particular suggestion of fancy prompted" (*The Dublin Review*, April 1907; pp. 258 ff.). It is hard to see what 'space' has to do with translating Greek verse. What follows is better: "Sometimes the Greek itself seems prophetically haunted with echoes of English imitations that seem to make a particular rhythm from Herrick or Housman almost classically appropriate as the vessel to receive as much of the original as I may be able to transfuse." In dealing with great Greek poetry it is a common experience that, when one has read all the versions by master hands, one is brought no farther by their combined effect than just the threshold of the Greek original. And there one stops, like another Moses seeing the Holy Land from a distance.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The Oxford University Press, 1941; \$2.00.

<sup>2</sup> See Professor W. H. Alexander's essay, "Adaptative Translations of the Classics," *The Classical Journal*, March, 1943; p. 337 ff.

Teachers of Latin and Greek will be pleased to learn of an important scholarly undertaking launched a year ago by the Catholic University of America under the vigorous editorship of Rev. Johannes Quasten, S.T.D., Professor of Ancient Church History and Christian Archaeology. What interests us here most is that this new series, *Studies in Christian Antiquity*, keeps in close touch with the ancient classics. The early Christian centuries were a period of transition from ancient Greece and Rome to medieval and, by consequence, our own times. This  $\xi\omega\varsigma$  of the modern era was a period of unusual intellectual fermentation when the leaven of the new religion began its work of remodeling ancient thought and feeling. Naturally, as Dr. Quasten rightly insists (*Journal of American Philology*; April, 1942, p. 208), the ecclesiastical writers cannot be understood without a thorough knowledge of ancient culture. Much of the spiritual treasure of that enchanted period lies as yet hidden or is little appreciated, and waits for the lamp of classical scholarship to break the spell and dissipate the darkness.

The initial volume of *Studies*, "Death and Burial in Christian Antiquity," by Alfred C. Rush, C.S.S.R., illustrates the intentions of its founder. Treating of "one of the most momentous issues" confronting the early Church, "the policy to be adopted toward the ancient pagan cult of the dead," Dr. Rush discusses both the concept of death (1-87) and the rites centering about death and burial (89-273) "against the background of belief and practice in the past, wheresoever, whether among Jews or pagans, the nomen Christianum was accepted." For fuller information see J. C. Plumpe's review of this work in *Classical Weekly*, March 1, 1943.

Only a year after the Catholic University had started *Studies in Christian Antiquity*, Dr. Quasten and Professor Stephan Kuttner, of the same University, are presenting us with Volume I of *Traditio*, which, to judge from its subtitle, *Studies in Ancient and Medieval History, Thought and Religion*, is a scholarly venture of great promise and far-reaching significance. Here, again, the classical interest is, if not exclusively dominant, still very pronounced. In fact, the opening paper of Volume I, "Vivum Saxum, Vivi Lapides," by J. C. Plumpe, discusses the Concept of "Living Stone" in Classical and Christian Antiquity. For fuller explanation consult the printed Circular issued by Cosmopolitan Science and Art Service Co., Inc., 638 Lexington Ave., New York.

## A Roman Echo of Simonides

It does not seem to have been noticed that there is an echo of Simonides' famous epigram (see *CLASSICAL BULLETIN*, February 1943, 37) in Livy's account of what might be called the Roman Thermopylae, the battle of Cannae. In the twenty-second book of Livy's History (chap. 49), Cn. Cornelius Lentulus, tribunus militum, is described as offering his horse to the fallen consul L. Aemilius Paulus. The consul commends Lentulus for his act of generosity, but pleads with him to make his escape and warn the senate and the people of Rome of the danger awaiting them. Furthermore, he was to announce to Quintus Fabius, surnamed the 'Cunctator,' that he had lived and died in obedience to his injunctions:

Abi, nuntia publice patribus, urbem Romanam muniant, ac priusquam hostis victor advenit, praesidiis firmant; privatim Q. Fabio, Aemilium praeceptorum eius memorem et vixisse adhuc et mori.

There are differences as well as similarities here with Simonides. The announcement in each case was to be made to the populace. Livy, however, at this point deviates from his Greek model and makes the consul abide by the *praecepta* of one individual rather than the *ρήματα* of a whole people.

Fordham University

JOHN J. H. SAVAGE

### A Rhetorical Approach to Cicero<sup>1</sup>

By SR. M. VIVIENNE HAZELETT, S.S.N.D.

Community High School, Aviston, Illinois

Any attempt at discussion of the orations of Cicero should be prefaced by a few remarks in true Ciceronian style about the *locus ad agendum amplissimus* and the *conspectus iucundissimus* of my audience, but I shall assume that none of you need to be won over to the side of Cicero but are all acquaintances and even friends of the orator on trial. Cicero is, in a sense, on trial in the classroom of today. His popularity as a high-school author is waning before that of others who have written Latin that has 'more life,' less of the artificial, more 'intrinsic interest' in a word, more 'student appeal.'

But Cicero has often not been given an opportunity to make his full appeal to his student audience because he has not been allowed to *speak* to them. An oration that is merely read seldom moves anyone. Yet that is too often the fate of even the greatest speeches of Cicero in our modern classrooms. Day after day the students pore over the pages of some 'dry-as-dust' oration, never getting a taste of the life, the literary beauty, that is in them, because they are not studied from the proper point of view. Cicero's orations are classics in the field of rhetoric; and just as a poem should be judged by the canons of poetry, just as drama should be appreciated as drama, so rhetoric should be accorded its proper study.

Therefore in the suggested method which I make bold to offer for what it is worth, I have prescinded from any discussion of grammatical procedure in the study of the orations. The study of grammar is, of course, necessary, very necessary, for a proper understanding of the literal sense of the written words; and it is only around that core of literal sense that the rhetorical elements must cling.

Every oration delivered by Cicero was spoken with a definite intention in view; and every word uttered, every gesture, every slightest innuendo of the voice, every figure of speech employed, all point to that final end, and served, when spoken, to capitalize it in the minds of his hearers. This final intention or effect is, in general, the same for every speech: to move its hearers to act by appealing to their emotions, intellects, and wills. To achieve this end the orator must please, impress, and inspire his audience by all the means he has at his command.<sup>2</sup> Such a rhetorical effect is a rather intangible something, which is heard and felt but hard to grasp directly. Hence, to study these *effects* we must devote our attention to the more tangible *means*—the

figures of rhetoric which the orator employs to underline, to italicize, to capitalize the thought he wishes to convey. In numerous studies of the rhetorical qualities of selected speeches of Cicero, some fifty and more of these devices have been discovered, classified, and discussed. It is obvious that no teacher could ever burden her students with a knowledge of the names of all these figures, to say nothing of expecting them to recognize all of them in context. Such a procedure would, if attempted, defeat the very purpose of the attempt; for oratory, as a distinctive form of literature, should, in my opinion, be taught primarily for appreciation. It should, however, be intelligent appreciation; the student should be able to say not only "I like this," but "I like this for this reason . . ."; "the speaker has chosen this means . . . and this . . . to achieve his effect." But neither should the whole study of an oration consist of such minute analysis either on the part of the teacher or of the student; pupil analysis should be limited to selected significant passages containing obvious flights of rhetoric. The teacher analysis is perhaps best when most informal—calling the attention of students to a striking figure as it is met in translation, or comparing a passage rhetorically expressed with the same idea expressed in very ordinary language. From this it is clear that the teacher should have a very thorough knowledge of the elements of rhetoric and should possess some knowledge of Latin periodic sentence structure and of Ciceronian prose rhythm, else he will be unable to perceive many of the subtler devices and more intangible elements which a master orator employs, and will, therefore, be lagging far behind in personal appreciation and the ability to kindle the flame of enthusiasm in his pupils.

Every teacher must, in the last analysis, use his own method of presentation in order to teach successfully, but there are certain points which can well be included in every teacher's plan. Some of these I have set down in the following plan of procedure. It is, of course, too comprehensive to be employed in its entirety in any given lesson, but at the discretion of the teacher certain features can be readily adapted to any of the speeches selected for study.

1. *Presentation of the background:* This point of procedure should be employed in every speech. It does not have a direct bearing on the production of the rhetorical effects, but it does on the perception and appreciation of them, much as the degree of our knowledge of world conditions today modifies our appreciation and evaluation of the speeches we hear over our radios and read in our newspapers. Small but select bibliographies of readings for background will be found in practically every modern textbook of Cicero in addition to a preliminary sketch in connection with each oration, giving the salient facts of the case.

2. *Interpretative reading of individual thought units by the teacher:* This phase of teaching is too frequently neglected, yet it is one of the greatest aids to understanding and appreciating any piece of literature. Orations were meant to be spoken, not read; and, though it may be an insult to our intelligence, we must admit that we are more often moved by *how* a thing is said than by *what* is said. No teacher, of course, will be able to put all the feeling into a speech which Cicero

did, but even the slightest effort in this direction is better than nothing. The personality, vivacity, and interest of the teacher will figure greatly here; he must be unafraid to dramatize to an exaggerated degree. It means preparation and practice and a great deal of energy expended, but it will be worth the effort when pupil interest and response are weighed in the balance. I should like to suggest that the whole oration be read in this manner (part by part in preparation for each day's work); but if this seems too impractical and too time-consuming, then at least the more rhetorical passages could be given this attention.

3. *Sense-line presentation of chosen passages:* The sense-line arrangement of the text seems to be the most effective device yet discovered for giving a *visual* approach to rhetoric. Again, the whole text thus arranged would be ideal, but until such texts are provided the teacher will have to use his own ingenuity in supplying the deficiency. Not only does the sense-line presentation give a concrete *image* of the structure of the sentence and the unfolding of the thought, but by a system of underlining, italicizing, tabulating, etc., the rhetorical figures also may be made to stand out. A sense-line arrangement of particularly striking passages might well be placed on the board and given to the pupils on mimeographed sheets and then analyzed as a group project.<sup>3</sup>

4. *Translation—group work:* The first translation of any passage should, I believe, be done as a group project. This eliminates an injudicious use of 'ponies' or prevents an incorrect translation's becoming fixed by memorization, and at the same time gives the teacher an opportunity to inculcate right methods of approach. In this connection I should say that the Latin-word-order method is, in my opinion, the only approach that will develop proper understanding and appreciation of the oration as an oration, since by it the pupil attacks the Latin thought in the same order in which it came to the audience of the speaker. If we destroy this order we are bound to distort the effect which the speaker intended to produce. The sense-line arrangement is an invaluable tool for the teacher who wishes to use this natural method of grasping the thought. This does not mean that the thought is to be rendered into English in the Latin order; it should be *grasped* in that order but rendered in a manner which conforms to the genius of the English language.

5. *Pupil study—perfecting of translation:* This step follows very closely upon the one immediately preceding and is self-explanatory. It simply means that, after the assignment has been worked over in class, the pupils work over it again in order to obtain a full comprehension of its contents and a fluent English rendition of it if that is so desired.

6. *Analysis of passages for particular means chosen to secure rhetorical effects:* To develop this point I have chosen a concrete example from the *Pro Marcello*, and by the method of treatment chosen shall try to show how this phase of the procedure combines with the interpretive reading and sense-line arrangement to bring out the rhetorical effect with the greatest clarity and force.

1. Nulla est enim tanta vis

2. quae non ferro et viribus debilitari frangique possit:

3. animum vincere,
4. iracundiam cohibere,
5. victo temperare,
6. adversarium nobilitate, ingenio, virtute praestantem
7. non modo extollere iacentem,
8. sed etiam amplificare eius pristinam dignitatem,
9. haec qui faciat
10. non ego eum cum summis viris comparo,
11. sed simillimum deo iudico.

1. Hyperbaton: nulla...vis

3. Asyndeton: (et)...(et)...(et)...Symmetry: { a. vincere  
i. cohibere  
v. temperare

4. Asyndeton: (et)...(et)

7. Antithesis: non modo...sed etiam

8.

10. Antithesis: non-sed. Climax: summis viris...deo

In teaching such a passage it should first be read in such a manner as to bring out the structural and rhetorical elements *audibly*, while the students have the *visual* presentation before them on the board. The analysis should be done as a group project, using differently colored chalk to underline the rhetorical figures as they are discovered, or some similar device. This process of *discovering* the means which the orator employed to produce his effects is only half the enjoyment of the study of the passage. It remains to analyze the actual effects produced—the effect of the passage as a whole, and the effect of each member of it, and how each contributed to the total effect. The teacher cannot go into this phase of the work very deeply with high-school students; but most students will be able to detect the note of impressiveness, the feeling of speed, of brevity, of force, increased vividness of description, the shades of emotion, and will be able to see some relationship between these effects and their causes, with difficulty, perhaps, in the early stages of the work, but with increasing facility and joy as the study continues.

7. *The incorporation of the rhetorical effect in the English translation:* Perhaps rather than 'translation' I should have said a free rendition of the Latin in a rhetorical English style. This gives the pupils an opportunity to apply the principles and devices they have discovered, insofar as they are applicable to English, and, at the same time, gives the teacher a chance to test the results of his teaching. Written versions would seem to be better than oral for this purpose, though both may be employed. As a rule, pupils find it difficult to give a fluent oral rendition, and written translations afford an opportunity for rereading, criticism, and evaluation by the pupils of one another's work.

8. *Interpretive reading of the oration by pupils:* I have designedly left this step until last for various reasons. First of all, a rereading of a passage serves to reunify an entity that has been dissected in the process of analysis, and so strengthens the relationship of part to part, and part to whole. Secondly, the teacher read the passage in the beginning of the study; now the pupil who "knows what it's all about" is eager to try his skill at reading Latin aloud with thought and expression. Thirdly, the aim of the study of Latin Literature is the appreciation of it as *Latin*, as well as *Literature*, or I might say as *Latin Literature* directly, rather than through the medium of the vernacular. Now, in studying the masterpieces of literature in any language the greatest appreciation can be derived only when they



are read in the original. This is no less true of Latin than of modern languages, but it is too often ignored or forgotten. Therefore, I say, the pupils should be trained and allowed to read Latin as Latin and in Latin, rather than merely reading Latin words with the eyes and struggling to convert them into English words with the lips, producing a result that is good in neither language. But—and this should be stressed—this reading by the pupils must follow his understanding of the content and his grasping of the underlying rhetoric, else it will not be interpretive. For this reason I do not think high-school pupils should be made to read Latin (and especially rhetorical Latin) at sight, until they have reached the stage of development where they are able to grasp the thought-content at sight. And, for the same reason, I think actual translation of a passage as a final step or test procedure is unnecessary; for if a pupil can read Latin with proper phrasing, pauses, and emphasis, it seems to me that he has already transcended the level of mere translation, and has achieved the special aim of our teaching—the grasping and appreciation of rhetorical effect.

In conclusion, I should like to call your attention to an article which appeared in THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN for October, 1936. It is entitled "Go It, Cicero" and was written by a teacher interested in having his class grasp the full emotional appeal of Cicero through a presentation of the oration as an oration. The student reaction as evinced by their comments is enlightening to those who feel that such a procedure is too visionary or optimistic, and is encouraging to those who are interested in making the experiment. Read the article; make the test. It spells success.

<sup>1</sup> Read at the Latin Teachers Institute during the Summer Session of St. Louis University, June 1942.

<sup>2</sup> See Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*, Book XI, Chap. 3.

<sup>3</sup> A series of essays in THE CLASSICAL BULLETIN, from 1927 to 1937, explains the nature and value of the sense-line method. See especially Vol. XII (1936) 46-48, and XIII (1937) 69-71.

### Cicero's ORATOR in Outline

#### I. Cicero's preliminary survey of the ORATOR, 1-42

- A. Acquiescence in Brutus's request, 1-2
- B. Encouragement for aspiring orators, 3-6
- C. Subject of the treatise: the Ideal Orator, 7-32
  - 1. His non-existence except as a metaphysical entity, 7-10
  - 2. Essentials of his training: philosophy and rhetoric, 11-19
  - 3. His style, 20-32
    - a. Appropriate use of the three styles, 20-22
    - b. Atticism in theory and practice, 22-32

- D. Dedication of the ORATOR to Brutus, 33-35
- E. Exclusion of epideictic oratory from the treatise, 36-42

#### II. The Ideal Orator in relation to his art, 43-236

- A. His selection of subject matter, 44-49
- B. His arrangement of subject matter, 50
- C. His presentation of subject matter, 51-236
  - Paraphrase: importance of presentation, 51-53
    - 1. Delivery, 54-60
    - 2. Style, or use of language, 61-236
      - a. Contrast with other styles, 62-68
      - b. Correspondence of style and purpose, 69-112
        - Paraphrase: importance of propriety, 69-74
          - i. The plain style, 76-90
          - ii. The middle style, 91-96
          - iii. The grand style, 97-99
        - iv. Combination of styles in the Ideal Orator, 100-101
        - v. Illustrations from Cicero and Demosthenes, 102-112
  - c. Need of dialectics and broad education, 113-121

- d. Particular aspects of the speech, 122-139
  - i. Suitable treatment of single parts, 122-125
  - ii. The proposition and its development, 125-127
  - iii. Ethos and pathos, 128-133
  - iv. Oratorical ornamentation, 133-139

*Digression:* Cicero's justification in writing the ORATOR, 140-143

- e. Arrangement of words, 149-236
  - i. Euphony, 149-164
  - ii. Symmetry, 164-167
  - iii. Rhythm, 168-236
    - Paraphrase: justification of rhythm, 168-173
      - aa. Historical development, 174-176
      - bb. Cause and foundation, 177-178
      - cc. Nature, 179-203
      - dd. Use, 204-226
      - ee. Effectiveness in oratory, 227-236

III. Concluding remarks, addressed to Brutus, 237-238

Xavier University, Cincinnati WILLIAM R. HENNES, S.J.

### Epicureanism and Christianity

BY WILLIAM CHARLES KORFMACHER  
St. Louis University

'Popular' Epicureanism, conveniently summed up in Horace's *carpe diem*, seems of all ancient philosophies the farthest removed from the ideals of Christianity. Even the 'scientific' Epicureanism taught by its Greek founder and reiterated in the immortal *De Rerum Natura* of the Roman Lucretius is almost equally remote from Christian principles and practices. Yet it is one of the oddities of history that, among the numerous pagan philosophical sects represented in the second century of our era, Epicureanism was, in the case of a certain interesting personality, the one system associated with Christianity. The second century saw the rise of the impostor Alexander,<sup>1</sup> who succeeded in persuading the Paphlagonians that he was a prophet sent by Asclepius, and who established himself in state at Abonoteichus. His oracle there became widely famous, and his deceptions were so convincing as to deceive even the elect in the contemporary philosophical world. Only Christians and Epicureans failed to do him reverence, and so the cry 'Out with the Christians' and 'Out with the Epicureans' prevailed at his shrine. The Christians, of course, recognized no pagan divinity; and the very foundation of Epicureanism had been built upon a hatred of the superstition manifested by the Graeco-Roman state religions. In ordinary practice, the Epicurean could display outer respect toward the gods of his native city, with an inner interpretation and reservation of judgment. But Christians, as even so early a pagan witness as the Younger Pliny<sup>2</sup> assures us, steadfastly refused even the few grains of incense before the image of the emperor, for the reason that the act implied a recognition of divinity in the *genius* of the emperor.

However, 'scientific' Epicureanism involved certain striking practices and teachings that have led more than one scholar<sup>3</sup> to see therein distant hints of Christianity. Now, with necessary and obvious reservations, such comparisons need offend no one. Like many ancient philosophies, Epicureanism was a religion to those of its adherents who accepted it seriously, even though it did not possess the ritual and pomp of a contemporary state system. Obviously, it was but a natural religion, considerably more imperfect than certain other natural religions of which we have record. Christianity, as a supernatural religion, is therefore essentially different

from it in all respects; even the same act of virtue, as inspired on the one hand by a natural Epicureanism and on the other by the supernatural motivation of Christianity, will therefore differ essentially.

With such premises understood, one may not unprofitably seek and find many interesting 'parallels,' of varying closeness, between the two systems. Their number and their exposition are, clearly, beyond the limits of a note such as this, and it is possible only to suggest a few instances out of a much larger available number.

For example, a certain basic universality on the part of Epicureanism with regard to its adherents strikes a responsive chord in Christian ideals. For while many ancient philosophies seem to have condemned<sup>4</sup> the common man and to have directed their saving doctrines only to a chosen few, the Garden of Epicurus was open to both sexes and to all degrees of social life, even to that of slaves; and the founder Epicurus himself seems to have had a kindly and loveable feeling for children<sup>5</sup> as well. Again, Epicureans contemporary with Epicurus and their successors seem to have entertained for the founder feelings of the deepest veneration; he was hailed as a savior, a giver of the richest blessings, and a very god,<sup>6</sup> although Epicureanism insisted upon a complete annihilation of personality at death, so that an actual apotheosis of Epicurus would have been repugnant to the system.

To the Epicurean, one of the most valuable possessions a man might have was that of friendship. The twenty-seventh of Epicurus' *Kuriai Doxai* or "Basic Doctrines" informs us that "of all the goods philosophy obtains towards the blessedness of a full life, by far the greatest is the gaining of friendship"; and the fortieth and last in the same list of pronouncements, speaking apparently of the Epicurean community, mentions how the brethren "live most happily with one another" and "do not bewail the departure of a dead friend as if he were an object of pity." There is more than a little suggestion here of the close ties that united early Christian communities. The Epicureans, too, professed a deep disdain<sup>7</sup> for external goods, such as wealth, luxury, and power. But while the Christian is counseled to forego these if they are an obstacle to his striving after 'perfection' and the following of Christ, the Epicurean disregarded them because they were powerless to insure him exemption from bodily pain and mental anguish, powerless, that is, to win for him that *ataraxia* or *securitas* or 'freedom from distress' of body and mind which he prized as the *summum bonum*.

The Christian conviction of man's degeneracy after the Fall and the need for regeneration by a Redeemer are distantly suggested by the earnest lines in the preface to the sixth book of Lucretius<sup>8</sup> where the Roman poet speaks of the human soul as a befoiled and shattered vessel awaiting the truth-telling words of Epicurus to purge and repair it. Temperateness in food and drink are fundamental in the teaching of Christianity; but it is strange to hear the founder of Epicureanism (whose very name has given us 'epicure' and 'epicurean') say in a letter to some friend:<sup>9</sup> "Send me a bit of preserved cheese, so that I may dine in state when I am so inclined," and to note the slighting way in which his

Roman disciple<sup>10</sup> recites the *carpe diem* formula in "Brevis hic est fructus homullis."

The Epicureans, in their views of deity, denied the gods of Graeco-Roman religion but yet insisted that gods did exist, even though these beings had nothing to do with the formation, preservation, and government of the universe, or with the actions of men, whether good or evil. Yet to these same divinities Epicureanism held that prayer was proper; not the prayer of petition or thanksgiving, for the gods were powerless to help or hurt, but rather the prayer of 'adoration' that recognized a fittingness in human reverence to the gods because of the superiority and beauty and blessedness those gods enjoyed.<sup>11</sup> The advocating of such selfless acts of veneration to the gods primarily because of their excellence is rather unusual in pagan thought (where the *quid pro quo* attitude of bargaining is all too common) and gives the Epicureans another parallel, however lowly and imperfect, to the Christian concept of the right of God to worship from His creatures because of His infinite goodness and perfection.

All in all, there was in Epicureanism a certain natural tolerance and good will, a certain willingness to live on terms of friendship and peace with fellow disciples of the founder, a certain ideal of humanely cultured temperateness and gentlemanliness, which approached that *humanitas*<sup>12</sup> which we prize as one of the genuinely great heritages from classical times to ourselves. The best in such an ideal readily suggests certain of the teachings of Christianity, which raises the best in human strivings to a supernatural plane.

<sup>1</sup> His story is told in Lucian, *Alexander Pseudomantis*.

<sup>2</sup> See *Epistula* 10.96.5.

<sup>3</sup> See George Depue Hadzsits, *Lucretius and His Influence* (New York, Longmans, Green and Company, 1935), p. 10.

<sup>4</sup> This was not universally true of non-Epicurean schools; the Cynico-Stoic teachers of the Empire, for example, practiced street-corner preaching for the masses of men.

<sup>5</sup> *Fragment V:C.35* (Bailey).

<sup>6</sup> See the enthusiastic eulogies by Lucretius, especially in the prefaces to books 1, 3, 5 and 6 of the *De Rerum Natura*; particularly, *ibidem* 5.7: "deus ille fuit, deus, inclyte Memmi."

<sup>7</sup> *Vatican Fragments* 25, 43 (Bailey); Lucretius 2.1-61, where the joys of a simple but virtuous (that is, Epicurean) life are celebrated.

<sup>8</sup> Lucretius 6.1-34.

<sup>9</sup> *Fragment V:C.39* (Bailey).

<sup>10</sup> Lucretius 3.914, in a passage (912-930) in which the poet heaps scorn on those who say, "Eat, drink, and be merry, for tomorrow we die!"

<sup>11</sup> See George Depue Hadzsits, "Significance of Worship and Prayer among the Epicureans," *T.A.P.A.* 39 (1908), pp. 73-83.

<sup>12</sup> The recognized *humanitas* of Terence is traced to Epicurean origin by Norman W. DeWitt, "Epicurus, Menander, Terence," *C.B.* 19 (February, 1943), pp. 33-35.

### St. Augustine on Loving Our Enemies

Omnis peccator in quantum peccator est, non est diligendus; et omnis homo in quantum homo est, diligendus est propter Deum, Deus vero propter seipsum. . . . Hinc efficitur ut inimicos etiam nostros diligamus: non enim eos timemus, quia nobis quod diligimus auferre non possunt, sed miseramur potius, quia tanto magis nos oderunt, quanto ab illo quem diligimus separati sunt. Ad quem si conversi fuerint, et illum tamquam beatificum bonum, et nos tamquam socios tanti boni necesse est ut diligant.

*De Doctrina Christiana*, I, xxvii & xxix



X

in

he

at

to

nt

er

mm

on

or

g-

e-

ssa

ess

eir

re

n-

w-

of

use

al

on

of

n-

at

ly

he

he

in

ace

ls;

ed

he

ar-

re

re

et

or

nd

an

,"

li-

us

.

is:

us

ia

us

m

os

rix